REMARKS

Claims 8-11, 14, and 19-20 were pending at the time of the Office Action. In this Amendment, claims 8 and 19 have been amended to clarify an aspect of the invention. Support is found in, for example, FIG. 6 and paragraphs [0055] and [0059] of the application-as-published. Care has been undertaken not to introduce new matter.

No issue has been introduced because amendments to claims 8 and 19 incorporates the range of the ratio of I1/I2 claimed in claims 10 and 11.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8-11, 14, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), Vink et al. (T.J. Vink, W. Walrave, J.L.C. Daams, P.C. Baarslag, J.E.A.M. van den Meerakker, Thin Solid Films 266 (1995) 145-151, hereinafter "Vink") and Adurodija et al. (F.O. Adurodija, H. Izumi, T. Ishihara, H. Yoshioka and M. Motoyama, J. Appl. Phys. 88(2000) 4175-4180, hereinafter "Adurodija"), further in view of Neerinck et al. (D.G. Neerinck and T.J. Vink, Thin Solid Films 278 (1996) 12-17, hereinafter "Neerinck").

Amended claims 8 and 19, in pertinent part, recites "the ratio (I1/I2) of the intensity (I1) of said first peak to the intensity (I2) of said second peak is around 0.5 excluding 0.46."

The proposed combination of AAPA, Vink, Adurodija and Neerinck fails to disclose the limitations of claims 8 and 19 regarding "the ratio (I1/I2) of the intensity (I1) of said first peak to the intensity (I2) of said second peak is around 0.5 excluding 0.46."

Neerinck's first peak has an intensity of 5.5 and Neerinck's second peak has an intensity of 2.5 as described by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action. Thus, the ratio of I1/I2 of Neerinck is 0.46. (See Fig. 1) In contrast, claims 8 and 19 require "the ratio (I1/I2) of the

intensity (I1) of said first peak to the intensity (I2) of said second peak" to be "around 0.5 excluding 0.46."

In addition, AAPA, which was cited for the substrate and the first and second amorphous silicon layers, Vink, which was cited for the indium oxide layer, and Adurodija, which was cited for the carrier concentration, fail to cure deficiences of Neerinck.

Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (*see*, M.P.E.P. § 2143.03) and for at least the foregoing reasons the proposed combination of AAPA, Vink, Adurodija and Neerinck fails to do so, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 19 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over the combination of AAPA, Vink, Adurodija and Neerinck.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this case should now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicant respectfully requests a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Hosang Lee
Registration No. L00,295

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/HL:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: November 11, 2008

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.